



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

**EVIDENCE — DECLARATIONS IN COURSE OF DUTY — SINGLE CARD FROM A CARD-SYSTEM AS EVIDENCE.** — The plaintiff, a physician, in order to prove services rendered to the decedent, offered in evidence a card, showing the name of the decedent, her address, and the dates of all visits made to her. Other evidence showed that such a card was kept for each patient, and the series formed the only books of the plaintiff. *Held*, that the card was not receivable. *Daniel's Estate*, 77 Leg. Int. 134.

Contemporaneous entries made in the regular course of business are a well-recognized exception to the rule that hearsay declarations are not admissible in evidence. *Shove v. Wiley*, 18 Pick. 558; *The Mayor v. Second Avenue R. R. Co.*, 102 N. Y. 572. The habitual accuracy of such entries, the ease with which errors are discovered, and the fear of the consequences of such discovery to the entrant make such evidence sufficiently trustworthy. The fact that pages may be readily substituted in a loose-leaf book, lessening probability of discovery, makes entries in such books less trustworthy. Yet the courts receive them. *Wyman, Partridge & Co. v. Henne*, 127 Minn. 535, 149 N. W. 647; *Armstrong Clothing Co. v. Boggs*, 90 Neb. 499, 133 N. W. 1122. See WIGMORE, EVIDENCE, § 1548. Even separate slips, not bound in any way, such as workmen's time slips and cashiers' deposit slips, have been admitted. *New York Motor Car Co. v. Greenfield*, 145 N. Y. Supp. 33; *Ricker v. Davis*, 160 Iowa, 37, 139 N. W. 1110. A rule of evidence admitting a single slip of this sort would be open to the objection that the jury can not, in determining credibility, judge of its accuracy by comparison with other entries. This objection would not apply to the principal case, however, because the card contained various entries made at various times. It resembled a complete ledger page. See *Presley Co. v. Illinois Central R. R. Co.*, 120 Minn. 295, 139 N. W. 609. Thus the principal case can not be supported.

**GIFTS — GIFTS CAUSA MORTIS — EFFECT OF THE TRANSFER OF A SAVINGS BANK DEPOSIT TO JOINT ACCOUNT OF TRANSFEROR AND TRANSFEREE — WHAT CONSTITUTES DELIVERY.** — Three days before death the intestate, who had a deposit in a savings bank, delivered to the plaintiff the savings account book together with a written order to the bank to pay to the joint account of herself and the transferee. The transfer was accordingly made, and, after the depositor's death, the account was transferred to the plaintiff, who notified relatives of the deceased that she was holding the money for them. *Held*, that the plaintiff is not entitled to the fund. *Hayes v. Claessens*, 179 N. Y. Supp. 153 (App. Div.).

A delivery of the specialty with an intention to transfer the entire property will operate to vest in the transferee the legal and equitable interest in the chose. *Hill v. Stevenson*, 63 Me. 364. See *In re Meyer's Estate*, 125 N. E. 219 (Ind.); *Cogswell v. Newburyport Institution for Savings*, 165 Mass. 524, 43 N. E. 296. And a delivery of the specialty with an intention to convey a joint interest should be effective to that extent. When there has been no delivery of the account book a transfer to a joint account of the depositor and another offers the difficulty that the transferor retains complete control over the subject of the gift. *Denigan v. Hibernia Loan & Savings Society*, 127 Cal. 137, 59 Pac. 389; *Norway Savings Bank v. Merriam*, 88 Me. 146, 33 Atl. 840. But even in such a case the gift has been enforced as a valid chose against the bank. *Deal's Administrator v. The Savings Bank*, 120 Va. 297, 91 S. E. 135. Or as a trust. *Booth v. Oakland Bank*, 122 Cal. 19, 54 Pac. 370. Or even as a gift. *State Bank v. Johnson*, 151 Mich. 538, 115 N. W. 464. The court has apparently confused the case with the situation where the donor retains complete control. It finds its solution in an absence of an intention on the part of the donor to make a gift. Although the donor may not have intended to vest the full beneficial ownership in the donee, there was an intention to give complete control